THE

Water-Baptists Reproach REPELD.

Being

A further *REPLY* Answering a Defence of *R. Hobbs* to his pretended *Impartial Narrative* of one *C. Bayly*, hereto a pretended *Quaker*: A Story of 11 years standing.

IN

Defence of an *Answer* to the said *Narrative*; clearing the People call'd *Quakers* of the *Water-Baptist's* Calumny and Abuse blabbed out against them.

By T. R.

Printed in the Year, 1673.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE Impartial Reader.

HAving lately read a Pamphlet (whose Epistle to his Reader is subscribed Richard Hobbs) weighed the Arguments, and consider'd the Tendency of that Discourse; I could do no less then write a few Lines as reasonable Remarks upon it. The Piece is averred by the Author to be a Sober Reply to Luke Howard: which had the Author perform'd, he neither had thus abused thee, nor occasion'd me this Trouble. And truly, Reader, I must tell thee, I have not often met with more Impertinency, or Abuse wrapt up in so small a Fardle; which confirms me, that the Promise of a Sober Reply in the Front of his Pamphlet was to Gild the Bayson-Pill, to swallow the more glib; without which Artifice (I doubt not but) he's sufficiently sensible the Palate of this Age would not easily touch, much less take his Potion.

How considerable Richard Hobbs is amongst his Brethren, I determine not; but as a Preacher, and Water-dipper at Dover amongst them of his Perswasion he is exercised, and has been for some years past, and writ a Supplement to a strange Prodigy, or Miracle, pretended to be wrought by his Brother R. James, a Preaching Dipper, or Water-Baptist in Lincolnshire.

The first piece of Abuse (I mean that out of Lincolnshire) presents the World with a Miracle, and I must say, a strange one too, a Leprosie and diseased Family miraculously cured by them, whose known and owned Belief, and Principle are, that Miracles are ceased: which exceeds the very Power of Christ's Apostles, that could not so much as cure the Lunatick having not Faith, Mat. 17. 16, 17. And again, that they should be so kind to a Quaker, and his Family, as to cure them, whom of all Persons they hate, and with of all Persons (they say) have not Faith; is beyond all Bounds of Romance. And this usher'd in as a late piece of strange Providence, and Finger of Heaven of few days, or weeks standing before publication; although the

Cheat *was Eight or Nine, some say Twelve Years past acted by these* Water-Baptists, *and now brought to light to their Shame, and their* Sophistry *discovered by* W. S. *in Answer to* Ralph James *his* Subterfuge, &c. *to which I refer the Enquirer. But to return to* R. H. *whose* Sober Piece *(as he would insinuate it to be) I have now under hand, and shall (as a* Friendly Reader, *to whom he directs his Defence of a pretended* Narrative *formerly publish'd concerning* Charles Bayly *sometimes a Prisoner in* Dover) *make such reasonable Remarks and Observations, as may give thee to understand the Author's Drift and Depth in his former, and renewed appearing in Print against us, and by which the Impartial and Unprejudiced may judge, Whether it be a* Sober Reply, *or an* Envious Retort *to his* Opponent? *whether writ in Love, or in Reproach? whether in solid and sound Judgment, or an airy and corrupt Mind? And I affirm, the Matter will best discover, of what spirit the Author is;* for the Tree is known by its Fruit. *Yet its not my purpose to charge his Disingenuity upon all that may bear that Name (for there are lost Sheep, whose Innocency and Simplicity is betrayed by such as* He, *who cause them to err, whose State and Condition I really pitty, and desire their Recovery) But with much Plainness to deal with him, who Brawles in our Streets, and utters a Reproach at our Gates, of and from which although in the* Sight *of God and good Men we are clear, and innocent; yet for the sake of the Simple, and all such, with whom any Doubts of us may yet remain, is this as a* Seasonable Caution, *that in the sight of all* Truth *may be clear, and the* Slander *may lie at the* Fool's Gate.

London, 1673.

T. R.

THE

THE Water-Baptist's Reproach REPELD, &c.

THis *Water-Baptist*, that he might appear a *Methodical* Writer, presents his Reader with an Epistle, as a *Key* to open the Secrets of his succeeding *Discourse*. But that they are of the least Allyance each to other in that sense, I cannot find; but *both* being wrought with Envy, and Madness; they may pass with a *probatum est* for *Companions*. Its some difficulty to determine, whether the Zeal of our Author run him more into the former; or latter? but certainly he may claim a considerable share of either. And if his *Proselites*, whom he passes through his Watery *Element*, be no better cleansed from their *Confusion* and Filthiness, then his Lines of Controversie; he might better spare his Pains, and they their Trouble. 'Tis possible, *R. Hobbs* presuming the Impress passing the hands of the Water-Criticks, or Book-Readers of the Town, might change its ill shaped Dress, and present it *more refined* to the World; so spared a Review of his seven or eight Moneths Pains. Yet I'le not set so little by our Author, but own to all that he barks, which may be Argument enough for Approbation, that he's fit to go out.

In his *Epistle* he thus treats his Reader, viz. *I do here present thee with a small Tract, containing a brief Reply to a Book put forth by* Luke Howard, *intituled*, A Looking-Glass for the Baptists; *The Contents of which Book and the Intents of the Author is to obscure the Truth of the Narrative, which is hereunto annexed.*

First I answer; *R. Hobbs* has not here dealt candidly with me, and his Reader, referring us to an annexed *Narrative*, when there's not one Section, Chapter, or Particular in all his succeeding Discourse, or any Piece annexed, that imports

any such Matter: so that the Cause of his Cavil cannot be easily examined, he not shewing us what he cavils at; an Absurdity, had it been by us, would have been baited to purpose. Yet that I may afford our Adversaries that Assistance and Supplement they ever denyed us, I have traced back the Controversie, and am willing to allow him the help of any *Narrative* formerly printed, so far as it may clear the Truth, of what's in *Controversie* betwixt us.

1. Then first, I find that in the *Re-printed Pamphlet* relating to the *Lincolnshire Prodigy*, there's a supplemental Letter, and a pretended true and *impartial Relation* of some remarkable Passages of *Charles Bayly*.

As for the *Letter*, it bears date from *Dover*, *June* 10. 1672. by a Nameless *Author*, and without any Accompt *to whom sent*: stuft full of Calumny, and Reproach, attended with such Circumstances, as might well excuse the naming either the Forger or Fosterer thereof; however its *Tincture* and *Complection* may well discover who *writ it*; and should *Richard Hobbs* deny to father it, and cast it upon some or other of his Brethren, as did his Brother *Ralph James*, when charged with that notorious Lye (in the Front of his Pamphlet of Eye and Ear Witnesses of that pretended Miracle wrought upon the Leper by his and his Brethren's Prayers) who said, *it was none of his Composing*; yet its Language would betray it: (and a further Circumstance, *Luke Howard* has charged it upon him, which *R. Hobbs* denies not by his Reply) not much differing from that Dialect in which his pretended true Relation is penned. And then

See his *Subterfuge*, p. 13.

See pag. 9.

2. The Relation relates to *C. Bayly*; who, say they, acted several things as a *Quaker* from the 13th of *Octob.* to the 22th, 1667. (which really was in 1661.) which the Forgers would charge upon all called by that Name, which is the Cause of Controversie betwixt *Luke Howard* and *R. Hobbs*, the first clearing, the 2d casting all the Dirt of *Charles*'s Miscarriage upon us; which *R. Hobbs terms* in *L. Howard* obscuring the *Truth* of the *Narrative*.

And that the Impartial Reader may have a just Understanding whether *R. Hobbs* or *L. Howard* has been Malicious and Cla-

Clamarous uttering a Reproach and Slander, cavilling against the Truth, and abusing his Reader; I shall descend in these few Particulars to evince to the impartial Understanding: and shall go on

I. To manifest the nullity of the *Water-Baptists Charge* by his *Letter* and *Relation*.

II Our Clearness from its Impositions.

But previous hereto I would have the *Reader* take notice, that its neither my Work, nor Purpose to vindicate *C.B.* (whose *Miscarriages* long since separated him from us, and against whom our Testimony was many years past given out for his *Disobedience* to that everlasting Light and Truth of God: for the Sake of which Truth *R. Hobbs* is so *inraged* against us) But to clear the Truth, and the faithfull Followers of Christ from the wretched Impositions and calumnious Impostures of our Malitious Adversaries. Then

I. The Nullity of *Water-Baptists Charge* appears in these particulars.

1. Its own *Contradictions*, and most apparent and palpable falsness.

2. His averring those things, that absolute necessary Consequence doth contradict and deny. Which if prov'd, will be no hard Matter to determine, Whether *R. Hobbs* his *Evidence* in this matter be sufficient to *prove* us guilty of his *Calumny* and *Reproach?* for which I need to go no further, then *R. Hobbs*, contradicting and charging *R. Hobbs* by his *Letter* and *Narrative* in Print.

1. *R. Hobbs*, that *C. Bayly*'s Miscarriages might ly upon us, and upon that Truth of God we bear Witness unto, he affirms in his said Letter (Pag. 17) that *C. Bayly* did those *Actions* at the same Time, when he was owned by us as a very eminent Man amongst us, yea, says he, "After he had acted these things in the "Narrative, they did own him as aforesaid. Here's the *Accusers Charge*, from which he would evince all *call'd Quakers* to be guilty of his *Miscarriage*. And to prove his Position, he lays down this onely Argument, and none other, viz. As appears by this (says he) *One Lords day, after this Tragedy was past, I came to visit my Brethren in Prison, and went into* C. Bai-

ly's

ly's *Chamber to reason with him: in which Time came in most of the* Quakers *of the Town, with whom* Bayly *went to Prayer, and divers of them I observ'd fall down upon their Knees in that Duty; my self, and three more Baptists stay'd in the Chamber all the while he was in Prayer: in which Prayer I very well remember he earnestly begg'd of God, that he would send his Angel, and bind me Hand and Foot, and cast me into Chains of Darkness.* Thus would he prove, *Ch. Bayly* was owned after his Miscarriages, as divers joyning with him in Prayer.

See the Letter dated *June* 10. 1672.

Answ. As for most of the *Quakers* of the Town coming there, or joyning in Prayer in such manner, as he deceitfully and falsly insinuates, is after in its place answered and refeld: but as to the *Time* instanced when this was pretended, I further say, *R. Hobbs* forgetting the Method his pretended *Impartial Relation* was penn'd in, or his Zeal out-running this Policy in the very Front of those his remarkable Passages gives us this very Story in the first Paragraph of those recorded Actions, and there relates that *C. Bayly* fell to praying, &c. (relating that Passage) O Lord God of my Life send down thine Angels and bind this thine Enemy Hand and Foot, for he (meaning *R. Hobbs*) hath opposed and resisted thy pure Spirit, &c. So that what is pretended to be last in his Letter, is first in his Impartial Relation.

See Pag. 1. & 2. of the Relation.

But should it be objected, That this Piece of Remark was ill plac'd in the History, and might be an after Passage, though first related here.

Answ. That is not probable, for the 2d Story following this of the Prayer begins thus, *About two Dayes after*, &c. (relating plainly to the Time of the former Story) And following that begins another Paragraph thus, *Within a short Time after*, &c. And ending the whole Relation with a Story of *Octob.* 22th, 1667. so that *R. Hobbs* his onely Proof of *C. Bayly* being own'd by the *Quakers*, after his acting those Passages in the Narrative absolutely falls to the Ground without the least Colour or Pretence of Truth, if the pretended Historical Impartial Relation be in the least to be credited. And to put all out of doubt

doubt, with a moſt ſolemn aſſeveration that Hiſtory is thus cloſed, viz: This Relation we that ſubſcribe do teſtifie in the preſence of God is true: under which is printed no leſs then *R. Hobbs*, and the Names of eight perſons more.

And ſo if the Relation be true, the Letter is moſt horridly falſe; and whether to believe *R. Hobbs* in one, or *R. Hobbs* in the other, or *R. Hobbs* in either, I leave the Juditious Reader to Judge.

2. Another Paſſage obſervable in *R. Hobbs* his Letter is this: neer the Cloſe thereof to give his Reader a pregnant *Teſtimony* of his *Modeſty* about the publiſhing the *Relation*, ſayes he, *The only* Reaſon why it was not publiſhed ſooner, was, becauſe I ſhould ſeem to ſome as if I had *boaſted*; And muſt *R. Hobbs* his Reader credit him in this? I muſt needs ſay, the *Phariſee* hath told a fair Tale to enforce a belief, that 'twas no ſmall ſhare of ſelf-denyal in him, that refuſed the proclaiming an inſtance of Providence, that would add ſo highly to his Praiſe. But alaſs! if *R. Hobbs* were guilty of any ſuch matter, he moſt grandly miſtooke himſelf in a few Lines before, where (ſurmiſing that ſome Readers might Queſtion the verity of the Relation or Honeſty of the Forgers to detain it in Obſcurity for ſo many Years before it came to Light) he excuſes himſelf and inſinuates to his Reader, that the Fault was not his: And ſaith *R. Hobbs*, If any queſtion, why it is publiſhed now, and not before, my Anſwer is this, I ſent a Coppy of it to a Friend in *London* ſome Time ago.

So that after this rational Accompt of his Innocency 'twere unreaſonable to charge *R. H.* for keeping this Story for ſo many Years for fear of his appearing to ſome, as if he had boaſted, as he gives for his only Reaſon, when he tells his Reader again, how little he was acceſſary to its being ſo long kept in obſcurity, giving this further Reaſon for its Publication; *I ſaw* (ſaith he) *the Truth of Chriſt might be advantaged thereby.*

Further *Inſtances* not much leſs *abſurd* (in this Letter) might be brought to ſhew the intolerable Folly and Abuſe of this envious Water-Baptiſt, whoſe bitter and malitious Spirit has led him thus to be a ſhame to his party, Abuſe to his Reader and Deriſion to juditious Men.

3. The

3. The next matter is the Printed Relation it self, at the foot of which is written, "This Relation we that subscribe do "testifie in the Presence of God is true, we being Eye and "Ear Witnesses of these things, some at one time, and some at "another: *Tho. Patridge, Simon Lovelace, John Heale, Christe-*"*pher Streeting, Thomas Williams, Richard Hobbs, John Hobbs,* "*John Finnes, Edmund Finnes.*

Here's there joynt Asseveration or Protestation, that the Relation is true, every Particle thereof averred unto by no less then Nine Witnesses; and this to credit their Story concerning *Charles Bayly*; which whether true or false relates not to us: yet to manifest the *Unreasonable Abuse* of its Forger, I shall remark his indirect Dealing with, and Imposing upon his *Reader.*

1. In presenting the Relation under the hands of nine Persons, as Witnesses thereto, yet in Fact five of them dead before the drawing up of the same: which *L. Howard* charges in p. 3. upon *R. H.* and has no Answer to it, and if that be not a full Testimony and Proof of that Piece of Abuse, look but to *R. Hobbs* his forementiond *Letter* from *Dover* of *June* 10. 1672. where he confirms the same in these words, *And when* (sayes he) *the Narrative was drawn, I shewed it to all the Persons, that are now alive, who all own every Sentence in it.* But whom alive, and whom dead, not a word: a double *Abuse.*

2. But 2dly, That which has a more Scarlet-dye, and renders the Forgers of it most criminal, is, that under their hands each Person testifies to every Particular of the Relation, as each being an Eye and Ear Witness to every Passage, and Particle of the *Narrative.*

Here I must take notice, that its usually observed, that the Judges (in Matter relating to *meum & tuum*) in case a Witness testifies beyond the Bounds of his Knowledge in any one Particular, do suspect him for all; yea, and reject him as a Person not to be credited: and shall so many, and frequent Instances of Unconscionable Abuse be exposed to the Eyes of our Understanding; and yet the Exposer stand with an untoucht Reputation? I leave it to the Impartial; and return to the Matter.

It

It had been Modeſt for theſe *Water-Baptiſts* to have teſtified; that ſome of them were Witneſs to *one particular*, & ſome of them to *another* (as probably they might) & not ſo audaciouſly to braſon it by their bold, though unadviſed Aſſeveration: *We (every one of them) do teſtifie every Sentence in it to be true*, and that in *the Preſence of God*: when 'twas *impoſſible*, that all could be privy to every *Sentence*, as the thing it ſelf fully demonſtrates. Its eaſie to reconcile, who made them to Err? viz. their *Paſtor R. Hobbs*, who ſpeaks the like Language in his Printed *Letter* of *June* 10. 1672. *When the* Narrative *was drawn, I ſhewed it to all the Witneſſes that are now alive; who all own every Sentence to be true, and ſtill freſh in their Memories*: when the greater number of them are dead, and none of them witneſs to one and the ſame Matter, as hereafter will appear.

Yea, but return to the *Relation* or *Narrative* it ſelf; and it preſents another Complexion: not all, nor one-half of them witneſſing every Sentence; but clearly otherwiſe. To ſome Sentence no Witneſs, other one, others two or three: and ſo giving ſuch Teſtimony to the reſpective Parts, as then were ſaid to be preſent at the particular Action: as appears thus out of their own Relation or Narrative.

1. The firſt Paragraph relates a Report of *Charles Bayly's* coming from *France*, and the Noiſe of his coming to *Dover*, and being taken from the *Quakers* Meeting. This was but a Report to the *Water-Baptiſts* Witneſſes, who then were in Priſon: and ſo they not Eye and Ear Witneſſes, as affirmed. *See the Narrative printed* 1672. pag. 19.

2. After this Hiſtorical Diſcourſe is an Account of *C. Bayly's* Preaching, *R. Hobbs* his Oppoſition, and *C. Bayly's* Prayer againſt him, that he might be bound hand and foot, &c. And this Sentence cloſed without Witneſs (with an &c.) and not one *Water Baptiſt* mentioned to be there, but R. H. much leſs all the pretended Eye and Ear Witneſſes. See p. 19, 20.

3. Next is a full Accompt of *Charles Bayly's Prophecy* (as there its termed) againſt *R. Hobbs*; in the Body of which Relation *Tho. Patridge* is ſaid to be preſent with *R. H.* and not a Word

of any other. Therefore to the foot of that *Paragraph* is subscribed, *Witness*

So but Two of the Nine Eye and Ear Witnesses. { *Thomas Patridge*, *Richard Hobbs.*

4. Then followeth a Discourse betwixt C. B. and R. H. where there is not the least mention made of any of the many Eye and Ear Witnesses to be then present; which Sentence ends thus: *This, I testifie, is true; witness my Hand,*

Richard Hobbs.

Certainly, *R. Hobbs* did much mistake the Point, when he by his *Letter* confidently affirm'd, *That all owned every Sentence to be true.* But to proceed,

5. The next Paragraph of the *Narrative* gives a further Relation of *R. Hobbs*, and closed the History of *C. Bayly*'s Propheceyes against him, which mentions not more then Three to be present; and is witnessed by *Tho. Patridge, Edmond Finnes, John Hobbs*: and had the rest been there, we had without doubt heard of it.

6. And lastly the Relator gives us a large Story of a Contest 'twixt *C. B.* and one *Wollett* a man frenzie in his Brain, who took *C. Bayly* to be one of the *Locusts come out of the Bottomless Pit*, because of his Hair, &c. where was present Five of the *Baptists*, as sayes the Story, viz. *T. Patridge, Ed. Finnes, Simon Lovelace, Jo. Hales* and *Chr. Streeting*; not one word mentioned of their *Pastor*, who usually bore the greatest part in the other *Acts*: or of the Three other writ under in the general Attestation. Yet sayes *R. Hobbs* in his *Letter*, *All averred every Sentence* (and he himself subscribed it) *to be true*: although many of them (as plainly demonstrated) absent, when several of there presented Matters were acted; & most of them dead, when the Relation drawn up: as appears largly by R. H's *Letter* and *Narrative* it self.

Now therefore I recommend it to the Judicious and Impartial, of what Perswasion soever, to judge of R. H's Labours, whether they be the *Product* of Love, or Envy? of sound Understanding.

derſtanding, or a confuſed Mind? And whether he now brought his ſuper-annuated and confuſed Story to Light in order to clear the Truth, and Love to his Oppoſers, as he boldly inſinuates; or rather as a Relique of that Enmity and Hatred, which the Wicked One has ſown in his Heart, from which his *Water-Waſhing* has not cleanſed him: and to the Witneſs of God in all I appeal.

Having waded through the Depths of *R. Hobbs* his unſtable Foundation, and vewed the irregularity of this *Watery-Builder*; let's now return to his latter piece of *Architect*, and examin, What Monuments he now raiſes upon the old Bottom.

1. Then firſt I obſerve, that in the Front of his Reply to encourage the Reader, who might ſuſpect his Cauſe (by reaſon of the confuſed witneſſing of the late Relation) he tells him, *That the Truth of the Narrative is further evidenced.*

Upon the view of this large Averment, I preſently turned over his whole piece, if poſſible to find him as good as his word; but alas; it was *Labour loſt*: for inſtead of producing freſh Witneſſes, and new Evidences, as he boldly inſinuates; he brings pregnant Inſtances of his old Abuſe, and that accompanied with an ill-favour'd way of *Canting*, which iſſues from him much like a *Proverb* out of a *Fool's Mouth*.

2. Then next, he proceeds to certifie the Reader, *That the Narrative was not publiſhed to blemiſh the Perſons of the* Quakers, *nor yet from a Spirit of Envy*, pag. 3. And truly, if *R. Hobbs* did expoſe his Fardle to the World in a Spirit of Love, and to advance the Reputation of the *Quakers*, I muſt acknowledge my Miſtake. And whether he did it not for the End he denieth; ſuch who weigh the Circumſtances following, may judge firſt of

1. An old Story of ſo many years ſtanding now to be brought out in Print.

2. And of a Perſon, that ſince theſe Miſcarriages has never been owned amongſt us.

3. And to be accompanied with ſo many Inſtances of ſevere Reflections.

4. Backed with ſuch a number of apparent Contradictions and Falſities.

As

As the Proverb is, *He that runs, may read*; and needs not an Interpreter.

3. But he tells us plainly, what his Quarrel is against, that *if any unkind Blows fall on us, we may know for whose sake it is*, pag 3. He and his Legion are against neither Great, nor Small, but *Israel's* King. Its against the *Light*, the Power of God his Battle is pitcht, sayes this *Water-Baptist*, *Its their Light Within, whom I withstand.* Alas! neither *he*, nor all the *dark powers* on Earth shall be able to extinguish it, whose Growth and Increase in despight of all their Opposition over-spreads the people not only in this Nation, but also in the Islands afar off; This accompts *he* his Enemy, and why? for any other cause, but by reason it tells him the Truth when he heeds it? This would he charge with all the *Villanies* and *Enormities*, *that ever were committed*, sayes this *Water-Baptist*, *to shew to what Enormities the pretended Light leads them.* Let me tell thee, Has there been one that has caused thee to speak Evil of the Wayes of God, he shall bear his Iniquity: but know, thou shalt not escape the Judgments of the Lord, who hatest the Light, and comest not thereto for Reproof.

But certainly, thou comest up to, if not exceedst the vilest of Men, to charge *gross Miscarriages* upon that, which many of thy own Party acknowledge *God's Gift, and good in its place*; they will at least say, *Its the Light of a Natural Conscience*, or *of the Mosaical Law*, or *the Reliques of that Impression, that was in our first Parents, which shews Moral Duties, and to know there's a God, &c. But*, sayes this *Water-Baptist*, *it leads them to Enormities*: which yet he neither has, nor can prove. I must acknowledg, that if he takes this for good Argument, If a Person having been Water-dipt, and owned the *Water-Baptist*-Faith, and whilst amongst them commits one or other Enormous Crime, or Wickedness, for which they disown him, or cast him out of their Fellowship, or Communion; if the Cause of his Miscarriages must be charged upon their Faith-Ordinances, and not his Disobedience to what he profest; then *R. Hobbs* deals with us, as he would be dealt withal; else not. Again, the *Episcopalian*, *Presbyter*, *Independent*, *Water-Baptist*, *&c.* all pretend the holy *Scriptures* to be their Rule for *Faith* and *Worship*, daily

daily Miſcarriages being acted, and fallen into by Perſons under thoſe Names, or Diſtinctions, ſhall it be ſaid, See what *Enormities* the *Holy Scriptures* lead them into? No; nothing leſs: no more is the Light of the Son of God to be charged by Reaſon of him who profeſſed his Truth, but held it in unrighteouſneſs: but as the Scripture ſaith, *If we walk in the Light, as he is in the Light, then have we Fellowſhip one with another, and the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt cleanſeth us from all Sin.*

So the Light is clear from *R. Hobb*'s his dark Impoſitions and our Fellowſhip clear from him, and all ſuch unfruitfull Workers of Darkneſs. But to cloſe his Charge, he exhorts againſt the *Light within* (Terming it *the dark Imaginations of our own Heads*) and rather to follow the Council of the Apoſtle *Peter*, which he *Sophiſtically* words thus: *we have a more ſure word of the Prophets* (ſaith he) *meaning the Scriptures, to which we do well if we take heed* (mark) *as to a Light that ſhineth in a dark place*, &c. when as our Tranſlation is, *word of Prophecy*, and not *Prophets*, as the *Water-Baptiſt* inſinuates, and whence he comments, that the *word of Prophecy* there ſpoken of is the *Scriptures*, and not the Teſtimony of Jeſus, the Spirit of Prophecy; although the *Latin* and *Greek*, as well as *Engliſh* has it *word of Prophecy*, *Lat. verbum Propheticum*, and the *Greek* λόγον προφητικόν.

Rev. 19. 10.

And if at this rate he can for his wicked End thus make bold with the holy *Scriptures*; I Queſtion not, but he will wreſt and expound his *Oppoſers* words to the like Purpoſe, yet I doubt not but to his own ſhame and *Confuſion*, which I ſhall deſcend to *examine*.

4. That I may not wrong *R. Hobbs*, who truly ſpeaks the *Subſtance* of his matter at the firſt, take his own words at large. (ſaith he) *This Quakers Looking-Glaſs is falſe, it preſents two Faces; one as if they did, another as if they did not own* Charles Bayly *for an eminent Quaker*. And that this is ſo, ſee what he ſaith Pag. 10, viz. *ſome new converted Friends*, ſaith he, *did own Charles Bayly*; But the Men-Friends, ſaith he, (meaning himſelf and three or four more Priſoners in the Caſtle) did not own him ſo much.

Here's the *Water-Baptists Charge* naturally dividing it self into these particulars, which I shall briefly examine and answer.

1. *R. Hobbs* affirms that *L. Howard* in Pag. 10. of his Book should say, *that some new converted Friends did own* Charles Bayly, viz. *for an eminent Quaker.*

2. But the Men-Friends (meaning himself and three or four more Prisoners in the Castle) *did not own him so much.*

1. Then to the first *Charge*, that *L. Howard* saith, *that some new converted Friends did own* C.B. *for an eminent Quaker*, I Answer that in Pag. 10 or any other page of his whole Book there is not any such matter, or any such Expression of *L. Howard*; nay, so much from it, and *L. H*'s words so far distant, to what this *Impostor* would impose, that they are clearly otherwise, for *Luke* reciting *R Hobbs* his Expression in his *Letter* of *June* 10. 1672. where *Hobbs* alledges, *that if the Quakers should deny* Charles Bayly *to be owned as a very eminent Man amongst them (at the Time of his imprisoment) that then they will render themselves the falsest Persons, that ever professed Religion.* Which Averment of the *Water-Baptist L. Howard* fully answers, and at the Close of his *Discourse* to that Point he tells them, *Amongst them at Liberty* (which then few were) *there were some, which did not own* C.B. *so much, as* R. Hobbs *reporteth of*: which *Luke* descends to *particulars* to shew. Which way of Answer to the *Water-Baptists Charge* is both proper and full, giving not the admittance to his Constructions, much less to affirm, that *Luke Loward* saith, *Some own'd him to be a very eminent Man amongst them.*

Pag. 17. of their Narrative.

2. The *Water-Baptist* charges *L. H.* for saying, *the Men Friends* (meaning himself, and three or four more Prisoners in the Castle) *did not own him so much.*

1. Here *R. Hobbs* turns *Critick* advancing his bald *Criticisms* to such a bulk, that they bear the Burthen of his ensuing *Discourse*: Not so much four or five times repeated in two Pages, yet an absolute Forgery. Had the Man spoke this only to his *Watery-Auditory*, it might upon his *ipse dixit* have passed for *Orthodox*; but he must give us leave to tell him, that he by his *Lines*

in Print has horridly wronged his *Opposer*, and as considerably abused his *Reader*: for *L. Howard* has neither word or Sentence, that imports any such matter, as he most audaciously charges: nay, so far were the Men from little or more joyning with *C. Bayly* in Prayer, which is the *Water-Baptist's charge* of owning of him, that they had not Liberty of *Access* to him, being then Prisoners in *Dover-Castle*, yet insinuates the *Water-Baptist* from this (and that as the words of *L. Howard*) *The Men owned him, but not so much.* Certainly, the Man was hard put to it, that thus straind to ease himself; could not self-Evidence of this *Antiquated Relation* against an *Apostate*, separated from us so many Years ago, have been a *Probatum* sufficient to have decided the Controversie betwixt us, but it must be thus redoubled, not only once, nor twice, but with more renewed Instances of Lying Abuse, and Imposture to the Shame of himself, and Sorrow of the Flock to whom he affirms to be a *Pastor*.

2. And out of these very words *so much* has this mighty *Artist* framed the very Pillers of his Building: so by *Theft* and *Violence* makes he a *Fortress* against us. Remember *R. Hobbs*, *though stoln Waters be sweet; her Guests be in the Depths of Hell.*

Certainly, had *R. Hobbs* taken a dose of Opium, he could not have more *intoxicated* his Brains then he has by this *Occasion* of *Contest*. And to see an instance hereof, take his own Words

3. In pag. 1. of his *Reply* speaking of his *Antagonist*; *we know not* (saith he) *but that he owned Bayly as much as the Rest did*; well then, where's the Owning? Said *R. Hobbs* pag. 1. *It appears by their then affirming and justifying him to be led by the True Light, as they did by their hearing him preach, and devoutly joyning with him in prayer*, Is this proof sufficient? Said *R. Hobbs* pursuing the *Question*, *If this be not a sufficient proof they own'd him, I know not what is, or can be sufficient; nor do I know any Rule the Quakers have, by which I shall know when they own one another.* Here our *water-Baptist* tells us, *if this be not the Quakers Rule to own one another* he's at's wits end; for *he knows no other.* But what, will not he turn back, and shew us his other side? yes:

after *R. Hobbs* has told his *Reader* this fair Tale, that *L. Howard own'd* C. Bayly *as much as any*, and the only proof of owning him was, by joyning in Prayer, &c. and *if that was not ſufficient Proof; he knew not what was*: he bringing again an *Objection* of *L. Howard, that he and ſome more were in Priſon, did not own him ſo much* (obſerve *L. Howard* uſes not that Expreſſion of *ſo much*, but its *Hobbs* his Forgery) which Negation of *L. Howard* the *Author* thus anſwers: *If by* ſo much *you mean, you did not joyn with him in his Devotion, I grant it; for your Reſtraint from him hindered you in that.* What's now become of the *only owning*? all this (*ſo much*) faln in the Dirt by a down-right contradiction. How well then our *Water-Baptiſt* has proved his *Charge* upon his *Antagoniſt*, I leave it to the *Conſiderate Reader*.

But more of Confuſion I have not often found in ſo brief a Writer; And I cannot but take notice of this Impoſtors Confidence, that in deſpight of all his forgeries and lying Citations of *L. Howard's Anſwer* to his firſt confuſed *Relation*, yet he's ſo audacious to affirm; *that he ſays no more of* Luke, *then he himſelf confeſſeth*: when *Luke Howard's* words, ſentences and expreſſions are as oppoſite to the *Water-Baptiſt's* proteſts and averments of them, as Light to Darkneſs it ſelf.

R. Hobbs, let me adviſe thee as a Friend, to receive *Luke Howard's Book*; and thy own Reply, and paſs Juſt Judgment upon thy own Work: if not, give me thy Reaſon. Let not thy Zeal, and rage againſt us ſo blind thy underſtanding to produce ſuch monſtrous effects; and after thou haſt inſpected thy own untimely Birth, and ſeen as well as thy *Reader*, of how little weight thy way of Argument is to rectifie the miſtakes, or reſolve the Doubts of the unprejudiced and unbyaſſed Inquirer at this day. Anſwer me, whether if thy old piece of envy and new-vampt *ſtory* of *C. Baily* were really true as to him-wards, what do's it more concern us, then the many hundreds, that about the year 1660. and ſince *Apoſtatized* from you; yea, many of your *Paſtors* and Teachers, that have *Revolted*, and ſome to that *Perſwaſion* you frequently ſtigmatize us with all, as being moſt *obnoxious* to the Guſt of the people? We have generally forborn to put them, and their Miſcarriages in Print, as being weak Arguments to found *Religion*, knowing that as well in the

Primitive

primitive times, and the first Apostolick dayes, as in these Latter Ages there were still such, who made Shipwrack of Faith and a good *Conscience*, and caused the Name of God and his Truth to be blasphemed and evil spoken of; and so it is now.

But why dost thou quarrel, *that an Account of our Friends dealing with* C. B. *was not daily brought to thee*? Its more, then the *Roman Priest's* themselves *desire* of persons not nearer related, then thou and us. Must thou be a *Confessor*; else no plain dealing? must we acknowledge to thee all passages of Christian Care to one or other, else justifie an Evil-doer? strange Inference! Its scarce that time of Day: when thou hast power, command it; till then, thou and thy *Calumny rest together*.

I cannot but observe, how natural it is for this *water-Baptist* to correct his *Antagonist*; yet himself double guilty of being more like a Scold, then a sober Christian; truly next after a personal knowledge of both, I recommend their Books to the Considerate *Reader*; who may with ease determine, where the fault lies: besides *Luke Howard's* solid behaviour in *Dover* has not bespoke him the scurrilous term of *wanton and lewd Ranter* as this *wicked water-Baptist* most falsly insinuates; whose upright Life, and sober *Conversation* never merited such unjust dealing from this Traducer, or any other. And so, I *justly Charge* it upon him, as a false *Accusation*.

And to evidence, *what spirit he is of*, the very *dialect* he writes in, and his own Work will easily *Discover*: Have we more *Modest Expression* from him, then the *vilest* or *debauchest* of men, canting at us, as if meer *Lascivious* and wanton. If he *mentions* the Women of our Friends, guibing at them thus, *Their Female Companions*, and such like airy *Epithetes*: if Sufferers; *upon the quaking account*, and *quaking Principles*, with many more out of that Treasury of Envy and Hatred, which in store he has long horded up against us, and now belches it out, as an unsavoury stink in the Nation.

I have read over the whole *Discourse* of two Sheets; and truly I think, the Press is not very often troubled to so Little, or so ill *purpose*: and did not the *Covetousness* of the *Printer* exceed the *Ingenuity* of the Writer, I Judge he had never passed his pittiful *Pamphlet*. As to what is more in his piece, its either such, as

fall

falls under the *apparent nullity* of the Forgers *Arguments*; or with the *confused* heaps of his meer *Impostures*, and *Abuse*. And if any thing else *remains deserving Regard*, 'tis in the Knowledge of such, whose *personal acquaintance* with the *Forger* and *Fact* can more *properly* answer, if not stop the Mouth of this *envious*, and *confused Babler*, with whom I leave him, and his *Piece*, as they see *cause* for further *Reproof* and *Examination*.

London, the 1st Mon. 1673. Thomas Rudyard.

A Postscript.

THe *Word of the Lord came unto the true Prophet* Ezekiel *against the false and foolish* Prophets, *who followed their own* Spirits, *and therein prophesied Lyes, and false Divinations, and caused people to Err: And he said,* Wo unto the Foolish Prophets, who follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing. *And God said,* Mine Hand shall be upon the Prophets, that see Vanity, and that divine Lyes, they shall not be in the Assembly of my People, *Ezek.* 13. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9. *And hath raised True Prophets in this Age to cry against the False Prophets, and particularly against* Charles Bayly, *who was many Years ago judged and denyed by the Prophets and Servants of the Lord, because he prophesied Lyes and false Divinations by the Leadings of his own unclean spirit, which ruled in his deceitful Heart: and because of these things he hath been shut out of the Assemblies of God's People (in Scorn called* Quakers) *for many years, although he sometimes appeared amongst them, as the false Apostles and deceitful Workers did in the dayes of the true Prophets and Apostles appear amongst them; and as the true then judged, and denyed the false; so have we done unto* C. B. *in and with the Light, Life and Spirit of God, and of his beloved Son Jesus Christ; and in and with the same we do and shall judge all* Dreamers *and* Prophesiers *of* Lyes *and* false Divinations, *who follow their own corrupt, sinful and*

and unclean ſpirits, from which the Myſteries and Secrets of the holy pure God lie hid. And now Richard Hobbs, *who ſayſt,* That *C. B.* was led by the *Quakers* Spirit in that Deluſion which he was given up to: *If by the* Quakers Spirit, *thou doſt mean the* Quakers Light, *which thou ſo much ſcoffeſt at, which I have cauſe to believe by thy own words in thy Book thou doſt mean; then I do tell thee, thou doſt ſpeak* Blaſphemy againſt God, *who is* Light; *and againſt his beloved* Son, *who is the* expreſs Image of his Subſtance, & Brightneſs of his Glory. *For I do tell thee, and all others, unto whom theſe Lines may come, That we the People of God called* Quakers *have never preached up, or directed any man or woman unto any other Spirit or Light, wherein and whereby Salvation is brought unto the Immortal Souls of Men and Women; but the* Spiritual Light *of* God *and* Chriſt, who is that Light, who lights every man that comes into the World, *John* 1.9. and 8.12. 1 *John* 1. 5,6,7. God, who commanded Light to ſhine out of Darkneſs, hath ſhined in our Hearts, to give us the Light of the Knowledge of the Glory of God in the Face of Jeſus Chriſt; and his Treaſure have we in Earthen Veſſels, that the Excellency of the Power may be of God, and not of us, 2 *Cor.* 4. 6,7.

W. G.

THE END.